

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
SEVENTH REGION**

REICHENBACH CEILING & PARTITION CO.

Employer

and

CASE 7-RC-21935

**LOCAL 16, OPERATIVE PLASTERERS' AND CEMENT
MASONS' INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE
UNITED STATES AND CANADA, AFL-CIO¹**

Petitioner

and

**LOCAL 9, INTERNATIONAL UNION OF BRICKLAYERS
AND ALLIED CRAFTWORKERS, AFL-CIO**

Intervenor

APPEARANCES:

George Kruszewski, Attorney, of Detroit, Michigan, for the Petitioner.

John Adam, Attorney, of Southfield, Michigan, for the Intervenor.

DECISION AND ORDER

Upon a petition duly filed under Section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, hereinafter referred to as the Act, a hearing was held before a hearing officer of the National Labor Relations Board, hereinafter referred to as the Board.

¹ The name of the Petitioner appears as amended at the hearing.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3(b) of the Act, the Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to the undersigned.

Upon the entire record in this proceeding,² the undersigned finds:

1. The hearing officer's rulings made at the hearing are free from prejudicial error and are hereby affirmed.

2. The Employer is engaged in commerce within the meaning of the Act and it will effectuate the purposes of the Act to assert jurisdiction herein.³

3. The labor organizations involved herein claim to represent certain employees of the Employer.

4. No question affecting commerce exists concerning the representation of certain employees of the Employer within the meaning of Section 9(c)(1) and Sections 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

5. The Petitioner and Intervenor agree that the appropriate unit for bargaining consists of all plasterers employed by the Employer within the State of Michigan, excluding the counties of Wayne, Oakland, Macomb and Monroe. Petitioner, Plasterers Local 16 (hereinafter Petitioner), filed the instant petition on December 28, 2000, requesting certification of representative in a bargaining unit comprised of the Employer's approximately 12 current plasterer employees. During the past two years, the Employer's workforce has fluctuated between 13 and 20 plasterers. Bricklayers Local 9 (hereinafter Intervenor), asserts that the Employer is bound to a collective bargaining agreement with the Intervenor effective from June 22, 2000 through August 1, 2003, covering plasterers, which bars the instant petition and requires its dismissal.

The Employer is a wall and ceiling contractor owned by James Reichenbach that primarily builds interior walls and installs suspended ceilings. The Petitioner and Employer were parties to a Section 8(f) collective bargaining agreement covering unit employees effective from June 1, 1998 through May 31, 2000, and have had a collective bargaining relationship since 1945. By a memorandum of understanding dated November 8, 2000, the

² The parties filed briefs which were carefully considered.

³ The Employer did not participate in the hearing held on February 23, 2001, and therefore, the parties were unable to stipulate to the Employer's activity in commerce. The record establishes that on February 6, 2001, the Employer was sent a letter pursuant to Tropicana Products, Inc., 122 NLRB 121 (1959), stating that unless it informed the Regional Office otherwise, the Board would assert jurisdiction over the Employer in this matter. Gregory Brisboy, business agent for Petitioner, testified that within calendar year 2000 the Employer performed at least \$100,000 worth of services for Michigan State University and at least \$50,000 in services for Barton-Malow, both of whom I take administrative notice are directly engaged in interstate commerce. Accordingly, I find that it is appropriate to assert jurisdiction over the Employer for purposes of the instant matter. *Tropicana Products*, supra.

Petitioner and Employer agreed to abide by the terms of 2000-2002 collective bargaining agreement between the Petitioner and the Lansing, Jackson Area Plastering Contractors.⁴ The contract is limited to plasterers employed within the Michigan geographic areas of Clinton, Eaton, Jackson and Ingham Counties, the northwestern portion of Livingston County, including the townships of Conway, Coccoctah, Handy and Howell, and the city of Howell.

The Intervenor was party to a collective bargaining agreement effective from June 22, 1997 through June 21, 2000 with a multi-employer association, the Michigan Council of Employers of Bricklayers & Allied Craftworkers (hereinafter the MCE). Although the Employer is not a member of MCE, it agreed to be bound to the contract for its unit employees on September 29, 1998, by virtue of James Reichenbach's execution of the 1997-2000 contract as a non-association member. The Employer did not serve notice to terminate or to withdraw from the 1997-2000 contract prior to its expiration. Consequently, according to the roll-over provision of the contract, the Employer became bound to a successor agreement between the Intervenor and MCE, effective from June 22, 2000 to August 1, 2003. The geographic coverage of the contract is the entire State of Michigan, but excluding the southeast counties of Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, and Monroe. Both the expired contract and successor 2000-2003 contract include the following language:

The Employer which is a Section 9(a) Employer within the meaning of the National Labor Relations Act, hereby recognizes and acknowledges that the Union is the exclusive representative of all of its Employees in the classifications of work falling within the jurisdiction of the Union, as defined in Article II of this Agreement, for the purpose of collective bargaining.

The Union has submitted to the Employer evidence of majority support, and the Employer is satisfied that the Union represents a majority of the Employer's Employees in the bargaining unit described in the current collective bargaining agreement between the Union and the Employer.

The Employer therefore voluntarily agrees to recognize the Union as the exclusive bargaining representative of all Employees in the contractually described bargaining unit on all present and future jobsites within the jurisdiction of the Union, unless and until such time the Union loses its status as the Employees' exclusive representative as a result of a NLRB election requested by the Employees.

The Employer and the Union acknowledge that they have a 9(a) relationship as defined under the National Labor Relations Act and that this

⁴ Despite the 9(a) language contained in the memorandum of understanding, Petitioner does not assert that it has a Section 9(a) bargaining relationship with the Employer.

Recognition Agreement confirms the on-going obligation of both parties to engage in collective bargaining in good faith.

Despite not specifically agreeing to be bound to the 2000-2003 contract, the Employer is making contributions to the Intervenor's fringe benefit fund and paying wages to plasterers in accordance with its terms.

As the Intervenor's current contract covers the petitioned-for unit, if its bargaining relationship is controlled by Section 9(a) of the Act, the contract will bar the instant petition. In the construction industry, parties may create a bargaining relationship pursuant to either Sections 9(a) or 8(f) of the Act. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the Board presumes that the parties intend their relationship to be governed by Section 8(f), rather than Section 9(a), and imposes the burden of proving the existence of a 9(a) relationship on the party asserting that such a relationship exists. *H.Y. Floors & Gameline Painting*, 331 NLRB No. 44 (May 31, 2000); *John Deklewa & Sons*, 282 NLRB 1375 (1987), enfd. sub nom. *Iron Workers Local 3 v. NLRB*, 843 F.2d 770 (3d. Cir. 1988), cert. denied 488 U.S. 889 (1988). To establish voluntary recognition in the construction industry pursuant to Section 9(a), the Board requires evidence that the union (1) unequivocally demanded recognition as the employees' Section 9(a) representative, and (2) that the Employer unequivocally accepted it as such. *H.Y. Floors & Gameline Painting*, 331 NLRB slip op. at 1. The Board also requires a contemporaneous showing of majority support by the union at the time 9(a) recognition is granted. *Golden West Electric*, 307 NLRB 1494, 1495 (1992). However, as to this contemporaneous showing the Board has held that an employer's acknowledgement of such majority support is sufficient to preclude a challenge to majority status. *H.Y. Floors & Gameline Painting*, supra; *Oklahoma Installation Co.*, 325 NLRB 741 (1998). Moreover, the Board has held that a challenge to majority status must be made within a six-month period after the grant of 9(a) recognition. *Casale Industries*, 311 NLRB 951 (1993).

I find that the Employer's agreement on September 29, 1998, to be bound as a non-association member to the MCE contract constituted an unequivocal acceptance of the Intervenor's unequivocal demand for recognition as the petitioned-for unit employees' Section 9(a) representative.⁵ As part of that agreement to be bound, the Employer clearly acknowledged that the Intervenor had submitted to the Employer evidence of majority support and that the Employer was satisfied that the Intervenor represented a majority of its unit employees. Accordingly, as of September 29, 1998, the Intervenor was the exclusive collective bargaining representative of the Employer's employees pursuant to Section 9(a) of the Act.

⁵ Petitioner argues that the document signed by Reichenbach on September 29, 1998 did not include 9(a) language. Although this is accurate, the document states that Reichenbach read and agreed "to be bound by all the terms and conditions set forth in the foregoing agreement," and there is no evidence that Reichenbach did not understand the significance of the contractual 9(a) language as recited above.

Since any challenge to the Intervenor's 9(a) status must have been made within the six-month period following September 29, 1998, and the Petitioner did not challenge the Intervenor's majority status until the filing of the instant petition on December 28, 2000, over two years after the Intervenor gained 9(a) status and at least six months after the current contract became effective, the instant petition is barred and must be dismissed.⁶

IT IS ORDERED, based on the foregoing and the entire record, that the petition is dismissed.⁷

Dated at Detroit, Michigan, this 23rd day of March, 2001.

(Seal)

/s/Theodore C. Niforos
Theodore C. Niforos, Acting Regional Director
National Labor Relations Board
Seventh Region
Patrick V. McNamara Federal Building
477 Michigan Avenue - Room 300
Detroit, Michigan 48226

347-4080-6700

347-4080-6725

347-4080-6775

⁶ Even if Petitioner's challenge to the Intervenor's majority status had been timely, I note that Petitioner submitted no evidence to rebut the Intervenor's majority status, either at the time of recognition or at any time since. The mere filing of a petition by the Petitioner does not itself challenge the Intervenor's majority status.

⁷ Under the provisions of the Board's Rules and Regulations, a request for review of this Decision and Order may be filed with the **National Labor Relations Board, addressed to the Executive Secretary, Franklin Court, 1099 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20570**. This request must be received by the Board in Washington by **April 6, 2001**.